EXPANDED DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

THIS IS NOT AN OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TAPE RECORDED PROCEEDINGS THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN HAS NOT BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE NCPB

NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD April 22, 2021

A special meeting of the Nashua City Planning Board was held on April 22, 2021 at 7:00 PM via Zoom virtual meeting.

Members Present: Scott LeClair, Chair

Adam Varley, Vice Chair Mike Pedersen, Mayor's Rep. Maggie Harper, Secretary Dan Hudson, City Engineer

Ed Weber

Bob Bollinger Larry Hirsch

Also Present: Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

Scott McPhie, Planner I

Christine Webber, Department Coordinator

ALL VOTES ARE TAKEN BY ROLL CALL

Approval of Minutes

April 8, 2021

MOTION by Mr. Bollinger to approve the minutes of the April 8, 2021 meeting, as amended

SECONDED by Mr. Pedersen

MOTION CARRIED 7-0-1 (Hirsch abstained)

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Sullivan went over the following items that were received after the case packets were mailed:

• Email from Matthew Bruton, BL Companies

REPORT OF CHAIR, COMMITTEE & LIAISON

None

COVID-19 Address

Mr. Varley addressed the COVID-19 pandemic as follows: Due to the State of Emergency declared by Governor Sununu as a result of COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12, pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically until further notice.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting, which was authorized to meet electronically pursuant to the Governor's order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, this is to confirm that we are:

1. Access

The Board is providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic access means.

The Board is video conferencing utilizing Zoom for this electronic meeting. Public access to this meeting is provided via Zoom. The link to this meeting is contained in the meeting agenda, available on the city website. The meeting can be streamed through the city's website on Nashua Community Link and also on Channel 16 on Comcast.

2. Public Notice and Access

If anybody has a problem accessing the meeting via phone, please call (603)589-3115, and they will help you connect.

3. Adjourning the Meeting

In the event that the public is unable to access the meeting via the methods above, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled.

4. Procedures

The Chair is in control of the meeting, and to the extent practicable and advisable the Board will follow the procedures outlined in the Bylaws. The applicant will present the applicant's case, followed by questions by the Board. The Chair will then allow for a rebuttal period for persons wishing to speak in favor, or with questions or opposition, before the Board deliberates and determines an outcome.

Applicants and their representatives, and individuals required to appear before the Board are appearing remotely, and are not required to be physically present. These individuals may contact the Planning Department to arrange an alternative means of real time participation if they are unable to use Zoom. Please note that all votes taken during this meeting will be done by roll call.

Planning Board meetings will be held electronically until further notice, when it is deemed safe to conduct meetings at City Hall.

The Planning Department and Board thank you for your understanding and patience during this difficult time.

Mr. LeClair said that Cases A21-0028, A21-0029, and A21-0062 will be heard together.

Mr. LeClair said the intent of this meeting is to take jurisdiction of the items, open the public hearing, get feedback from the Board and the public, and then table the cases until after a site walk.

OLD BUSINESS - CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS

None

OLD BUSINESS - SUBDIVISION PLANS

None

OLD BUSINESS - SITE PLANS

None

NEW BUSINESS - CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

None

NEW BUSINESS - SUBDIVISION PLANS

A21-0028 The Landing at Nashua, LLC, C/o. Dick Anagnost (Owner)
- Application and acceptance of proposal to subdivide a
41.31 acre lot, the product of the merger of three (3)
existing lots of record, Sheet A - Lots 218, 1019, and
1020, into (4) four lots. Property is located at 2 East
Spit Brook Road. Sheet A - Lots 218, 1019, and 1020.
Zoned "GB" General Business & "MU" - Mixed Use Overlay.
Ward 7.

Mr. Varley asked staff to confirm whether all three of these applications are complete.

Mr. Sullivan said yes. The only caveat is that the unique nature of several of the applications this evening involves several waivers and items subject to review under site suitability reports. Those items are discretionary in the eyes of the Board, so they reserve judgment on the completeness of those items. Other than that, the applications are complete.

MOTION by Mr. Varley that the application is complete and the Planning Board is ready to take jurisdiction

SECONDED by Mr. Weber

Mr. Bollinger asked staff if they accept jurisdiction tonight, what will be the proposed timeline. He anticipates that this will take more than one meeting.

Mr. Sullivan said there is a 65 day "clock" for decision making after the Board accepts jurisdiction. If the Board votes to take jurisdiction tonight, that clock starts running. The time limit can be extended with the consent of the applicant. He expects they can work cooperatively to extend the clock with the applicant if additional information is needed.

Mr. Bollinger said at the last meeting there was some discussion of contract terms being worked out with the third party review consultant. What is the status of that?

Mr. Sullivan said the City is currently in agreement with the third part engineer for stormwater and traffic reports. Hoyle Tanner Associates has representatives attending the meeting tonight to listen in on the discussion. At the next discussion, they will be prepared to address technical questions and prepare a report that outlines any deficiencies in the applicant's submission.

Mr. Bollinger asked who the primary point of contact is for this application.

Mr. Sullivan outlined the applicants and their representatives.

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

NEW BUSINESS - SITE PLANS

A21-0029 The Landing at Nashua, LLC, C/o. Dick Anagnost (Owner)
- Application and acceptance of proposal to construct a
Self- Storage facility. Property is located at 2 East
Spit Brook Road. Sheet A - Lot 218. Zoned "GB" General
Business & "MU" Mixed Use Overlay. Ward 7.

MOTION by Mr. Weber that the application is complete and the Planning Board is ready to take jurisdiction

SECONDED by Mr. Pedersen

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

A21-0062 The Landing at Nashua, LLC, C/o. Dick Anagnost (Owner)
- Application and acceptance of proposal to construct a
Costco Retail Store with Fuel Station. Property is
located at 2 East Spit Brook Road. Sheet A - Lot 218 &
1019. Zoned "GB" General Business & "MU" Mixed Use
Overlay. Ward 7.

MOTION by Mr. Varley that the application is complete and the Planning Board is ready to take jurisdiction

SECONDED by Mr. Hirsch

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

Brian Pratt, Project Engineer, Fuss & O'Neil, 50 Commercial St, Manchester NH

Mr. Pratt introduced himself as representative for the applicant. He also introduced engineer Matthew Bruton from BL Companies, architect John Eldorado, and Chris Lewis from Brady Sullivan.

Mr. Pratt said Fuss & O'Neil is the engineer for Dick Anagnost and The Landing at Nashua LLC. They are working closely with BL Companies, who did the design for Costco. Fuss & O'Neil did the design for the self-storage, traffic, and offsite improvements.

Mr. Pratt presented the site overview. He described the subject lot and surroundings. This property was formerly the NH Dow

Chemical plant, which was decommissioned about 15 years ago. Everything was demolished, and is under groundwater monitoring from the DES. In 2007 this property came in for a large development, but due to the economic downturn was never constructed.

Mr. Pratt said all three projects are closely interconnected. As part of this project they are extending Spit Brook Rd into a private access drive that connects to Adventure Way. The applicant is offering to donate part of the site for a potential commuter rail location.

Mr. Pratt showed an overview of the subdivision. The first lot encompasses the self-storage lot and the remainder of the land for future development, which will be retained by the owner. Costco is purchasing their lot, so they propose to subdivide a separate lot for the Costco and the gas station. They don't have frontage on any existing street, but the plan is that they will have frontage on the access way. The green lot on the plan is reserved for a future potential commuter rail, and the blue lot has an Activity Use Restriction area. The goal of their development is to limit excavation in that area.

Mr. Pratt said they are more than happy to schedule a site walk with the Board. They also understand this will be continued to a future meeting.

Mr. Pratt said the traffic on Daniel Webster Highway is a big concern. So they did a robust traffic study and analyzed five intersections. He outlined the proposed offsite improvements to improve traffic flow.

Mr. LeClair asked for clarification on improvements to traffic signals and timing.

Mr. Pratt outlined signal timing adjustments for multiple intersections.

Michael Bruton, Project Engineer, BL Companies, 355 Research Parkway, Meridan, CT

Mr. Bruton introduced himself as the engineer for Costco. He outlined the access points.

Mr. Bruton said this would be a relocation of the existing Costco. They have outgrown their location, and are looking to create a new store. The proposed Costco is approximately 156,000-sqft, with 798 parking spaces. He outlined site features, parking, landscaping, cart corrals.

Mr. Bruton said adjacent to the Costco would be the proposed gas station, for members only. This would be a gasoline only station for passenger vehicles. He outlined traffic flow. These are on separate parcels due to the 750-ft minimum distance between gas station parcels. This would be under common ownership with Costco. He showed the truck routes and loading areas for Costco and the gas station.

Mr. Weber asked about the Costco, and if they considered installing an electric charging station.

Mr. Bruton said JP Andrews is on the call, the director of real estate for Costco.

<u>JP Andrews, Director of real estate development, Costco, 45940</u> Horseshoe Dr., Sterling, VA

Mr. Andrews said it is a common question. To date they have done it in a few locations, and what they are finding is that they aren't being utilized. The reality is that electric car owners are charging them at home or work, where they are at a location for extended hours. When you put them in the prime locations up front and they aren't used, it creates wasted opportunities for their members to have prime parking and shop. In cases where it is a condition of approval, they have agreed to install infrastructure so that one day they can easily add them without tearing up the pavement.

Mr. Weber said he would not stipulate it. He is seeing in the industry in the next 15 years that this is the direction they are going in. It might be a good idea to put that infrastructure in for future use.

Mr. LeClair asked about truck deliveries.

Mr. Andrews described their fuel delivery for the gas station.

Mr. LeClair asked about the warehouse deliveries.

Mr. Andrews said deliveries are typically received between 4AM and 9AM.

Ms. Harper asked what the typical number of tractor trailers would be entering the site.

Mr. Andrews said he doesn't know. They sometimes arrive at midnight or 2AM and idle behind the building until they can offload. They typically show up between 2AM-4AM.

Ms. Harper asked how many trucks?

Mr. Andrews said he doesn't know. He can present that at the next meeting. It's going to be fewer than the existing site because they have outgrown that site and it needs more deliveries. This will be less because they have more area to stock.

Mr. Bruton provided an overview of the landscaping, traffic flow, and lighting onsite.

John Eldorado, Project Architect, MG2, 8444 West Park Drive, Suite 120, McLean VA

Mr. Eldorado presented the conceptual elevations for the Costco building and gas station. He described the architectural aspects of the design.

Mr. Bollinger asked if the applicant's traffic engineer is available or if they should address questions to the team in general.

Mr. Pratt said the traffic engineer is not available for this meeting, but he is very familiar with the traffic study and offsite improvements proposed.

Mr. LeClair said the next meeting will have the city's traffic consultant as well as the applicant's. It may be better to wait until they get through the full presentation.

Mr. Bollinger said he wouldn't want traffic to be skimmed over, since it's an essential part of this proposal.

Mr. LeClair asked the architect if there was any consideration of canopies over the doors.

Mr. Eldorado said not really, but they do a vestibule.

Ms. Harper asked if there isn't an entrance from the cart area to the vestibule, or if customers have to go around to the front area.

Mr. Eldorado said there is no direct entrance, but it will be used for storage.

Ms. Harper referred to the tire center, and asked if vehicles would be stored overnight.

Mr. Eldorado said they won't be storing cars.

Mr. Pratt provided an overview of the self-storage facility. He outlined traffic circulation, grading, and stormwater management. The site has a large infiltration basin onsite, and they did design the entire development with enough underground infiltration systems to completely contain 2-year storm events, which is ideal for treatment. He addressed landscaping, lighting, and utilities.

Mr. LeClair asked if there was any emergency power provided.

Mr. Eldorado said the warehouses don't have an emergency power, but they do have an option to hook up a generator in case of emergency.

Mr. LeClair asked if they have considered looping the water main.

Mr. Bruton said they are currently having ongoing conversations with Pennichuck. There are fire hydrants interspersed upon request by the Fire Dept.

Mr. Weber asked if above the 2-year storm be flowing out into the Merrimack.

Mr. Bruton said yes.

Mr. LeClair said they haven't hit the stormwater portion of the presentation yet. He asked for questions specifically on the self-storage site.

Chris Lewis, Architect, Brady Sullivan, 670 North Commercial St. Manchester

Mr. Lewis said this is a climate controlled self-storage facility. He provided an overview of the services they provide.

Mr. Lewis gave an overview of the site and building layout, and architectural design.

Mr. Pratt moved on to stormwater management. He described current conditions onsite, and said the site receives runoff from many properties to the west, which they have to take into account. They are providing two infiltration ponds to the west to capture flow from offsite properties.

Mr. Pratt said the site currently has no outlets, where it infiltrates. One of the waivers they are asking for is because they are connecting to a pipe that goes to the river. The wetland by Worthen Industries used to have an outlet, but in the 90s a development cut off that swale. In storm events it floods, and the

entire cul-de-sac and parking lot of Worthen Industries gets flooded. They worked with Engineering to come up with a solution, which is to tie into the 42" DOT drain line.

Mr. Pratt showed the underground infiltration systems. There is a very deep water table and sandy soils, which are good for infiltration. The Costco parking lot covers most of the Activity Use Restricted area. They don't want to disturb the soils much, so they have pitched everything to direct stormwater from that area into catch basins. These are sized appropriately to completely handle the first 3 inches of rainfall, which contains the most contaminants. Once the water is fully treated by the infiltrators, the clean water will spill out.

Mr. Pratt said to alleviate the flooding concerns they are also proposing some substantial improvements to the wetland area. They are working with the DES to perform wetland restoration and replanting.

Mr. Pratt said they are requesting a waiver because when they tie into this manhole, larger storms will outlet into the river. The Merrimack River has a peak that is about 48 hours after a storm event, and the peak flow from this site leaves about 12 hours after a storm event. They are going to "beat the peak", which is the preferred method for the DES Alteration of Terrain Bureau. This is better than detaining the flow onsite, because then the stormwater would be discharged during the peak event and exacerbating flooding downriver.

Mr. Weber said he appreciates the mitigation being proposed. He asked if the other sites feeding into this 42-inch pipe are mitigating as well. He doesn't see any issue with them discharging into the river after treating this.

Mr. LeClair asked how critical their ability to connect to the 42-inch pipe is. If that doesn't happen or is delayed, what is the impact to the development?

Mr. Bruton said the other option is to increase the infiltration systems to hold 100-year storms. That would be cost prohibitive. The other option is they could send flow to the north, but it's in the AUR and they want to avoid disturbing that. If they don't connect to the 42-in pipe the flooding behind Worthen would be exacerbated. They are trying to work with the DOT and Engineering to resolve the problematic flooding. He met with DOT onsite and they were very agreeable. They are just waiting on final approval, and he is optimistic the connection will be allowed.

Mr. LeClair asked if they have a time frame.

Mr. Bruton said they submitted it to them 3 weeks ago. They are hoping for approval in the next 2 weeks.

Mr. Bollinger asked if DOT approval would be a permit or letter of concurrence.

Mr. Bruton said it's not a formal permit. They are seeking a letter from the agency.

Mr. Bollinger asked if they wouldn't require any sort of easement. Who would own it?

Mr. Bruton said they are going to work out how to handle it legally. It's in the city Right of Way and a couple of private properties, so the DOT has an easement. The DOT will provide guidance on what has to be done.

Mr. Bollinger said if the Board were to approve the applications that may be a stipulation. This seems to be an important part of the site development.

Ms. Harper said the parking lot is pitched towards the basins, is there any curbing on the east side of the lot?

Mr. Pratt said all the Costco landscaped islands are curbed.

Ms. Harper referred to the wetland restoration, and asked what the future looks like for ownership and maintenance.

Mr. Pratt said the self-storage does not have curbing, the runoff sheet flows to swales. He displayed the wetland and showed their proposed improvements. He doesn't believe there are legal easements, but it has been flowing 30-40 years at least. They can coordinate with the City on maintenance. They met with Worthen, who seems pleased they are taking care of the flooding issue.

Mr. LeClair asked for a preview on how the stormwater design changes as the site develops to the north.

Mr. Pratt said they took that into consideration when they designed the site. It is likely that the future development would have another infiltrator in that area. Further to the north is in the AUR, so the future train station will have a mechanical filtration system. They can't infiltrate into the AUR, but they would treat the stormwater and tie into the Spit Brook culvert which outlets to the river.

Mr. LeClair asked if they will not come back down into the currently proposed system.

Mr. Pratt said no. More likely than not they would capture flow through deep sumps and treat them.

Mr. LeClair asked if they would have more updates on the discussions in the next meeting.

Mr. Pratt said yes. Because of the restrictive nature of the headwall in this area, the FEMA floodplain comes onto this site. They do have a small amount of fill in the floodplain in order to construct the access way, so they lose a little bit of flood storage. In order to address that and help with flooding issues, they are proposing to construct compensatory flood storage and additional wetland. It will prevent flooding in large storm events.

Mr. LeClair asked staff if the consultant will review the stormwater at the same time as traffic.

Mr. Sullivan said correct.

Mr. Pratt showed a diagram of how they tie into drainage systems.

Mr. Bruton outlined the permitting they will need to apply for, and their current discussions with Worthen Industries. He also described the improved access at Spit Brook Rd.

Mr. Pratt said because this is in the mixed use overlay, the Board has the ability to grant relief from zoning issues. There are three specific requests.

Mr. Pratt said the first request is two lots with no frontage. The lots will be accessed by a street that is constructed to city standards, so they do have adequate access. It is a private street, but the public has full permission to come and go.

Mr. LeClair said ultimately that affect just Costco, right?

Mr. Pratt said correct. The other lots have existing frontage.

Mr. Pratt said the second request is the use of self-storage in this zone, which is not a permitted use. It is allowed in the zone directly next to it, which is about 150-ft away. They think it's an appropriate use. It's a low traffic generator, and will look nice. Self-storage is popular, and there are a lot of residential units in the area.

Mr. Pratt said the third request is the gas station, which is not permitted in this area.

Mr. Bruton said the gas station use is a complementary use to the Costco warehouse because it is membership only. They feel it fits in with the neighborhood, and won't be driving additional traffic unlike a normal service station.

Mr. Pratt said there also will not be a convenience store.

Mr. Weber asked if they had a discussion with Boston & Maine about cleaning up their rail. There's a number of things that have degraded the area with debris. It's going to be next to your site.

Mr. Pratt said they didn't specifically discuss cleaning up things on their property. They are reviewing the plan from a stormwater perspective and the access. They are definitely cleaning up the wetland area and anything on their own site.

Mr. Weber said it's a conversation they may want to have with them, because it's unsightly.

Mr. Pratt said they can take a look at it on the site walk.

Mr. Bollinger asked if any zoning relief was required for this project.

Mr. Pratt said they went to the Zoning Board for a Special Exception for work in the wetland buffer, and a variance for signage.

Mr. Bollinger asked for information on the signage.

Mr. Sullivan said he asked the applicant to address that on the next Board meeting. He felt it was a bit too much for this meeting discussion.

Mr. Bollinger said that's fine. This was been a detailed and elaborate presentation, but there are some big ticket items that need to be discussed.

Mr. LeClair asked if the work they are doing down at the river requires Army Corp Engineers approval.

Mr. Pratt said the impacts for the headwall is negligible. They aren't impacting the stream bank, only repairing the damage.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR CONCERN

None

SPEAKING IN FAVOR

None

Ms. Harper referred to the future train station lot, and what access will look like. Will that lot be accessible from the East Spit Brook entrance, or over by near Fun World?

Mr. Pratt said the intent is that the ring road will connect through. Depending on the ultimate layout, the ring road will be the primary thoroughfare. They will have reciprocal easements. He said the Fun World driveway is actually the right of way for the property. Fun World's entrance could be upgraded. This hasn't been discussed or agreed upon, but there is the potential to come in through the properties on the north.

Ms. Harper asked if the utilities would be stubbed so that the lot would have access to them when it is developed.

Mr. Pratt said yes. He displayed the utility plan. Once the lot is developed they will stub it off for future connections.

Ms. Harper asked what the proposed hours of the storage facility would be.

Mr. Lewis said they haven't been established yet, it depends on the vendor they hire. Most of them operate by regular business hours.

Mr. Pedersen asked what AUR stands for.

Mr. Pratt said activity use restrictions area. It's an area determined by environmental studies to have contaminated soils. The restrictions are typical; don't remove soil from the site, don't infiltrate into it, no residential development, any

buildings have to have a vapor barrier to prevent contaminants from infiltrating.

Mr. Pedersen asked if those restrictions were put in place because it's a previous hazardous waste site.

Mr. Pratt said yes.

Mr. Weber said in Medford MA there was a former Mon Santo site they placed a shopping mall on, and they had mitigating stuff on top of it that would seal the contamination off. Is that going to be done with this site?

Dick Anagnost, Landing at Nashua LLC, 1662 Elm St, Manchester NH

Mr. Anagnost said the site has received a Brownfields covenant, which means the site has gone through extensive mitigation and clean up. The AUR is strictly to protect against any residual chemicals that may be inert in the soil. The proposal is to utilize the AUR portion of the site for parking, which the asphalt creates a cap and prevents additional infiltration into the soil. They have also posted a large bond with the Dept. of Environmental Services, which allows for testing of the ground water twice annually for the next 30 years, which is the remaining portion of the mitigation. All other cleanup has been complete. Therefore, once the asphalt goes over the AUR, the asphalt acts as the cap Mr. Weber was describing.

Mr. Weber said he appreciates that.

Mr. LeClair asks if there is a cross access easement between the Lovering site and these parcels.

Mr. McPhie said yes. There is an existing conditional approval for the Lovering site that requires a public access easement be granted when the subject lots are developed. A comparable condition should be placed on these approvals in favor of the Lovering and Home Store parcel for future public access.

Mr. LeClair said at this point he would like the Board to discuss some of their thoughts and concerns about the project, so the applicants can hear them and address them later on.

Mr. LeClair said the one traffic thing he wants to discuss is the construction traffic. What is going to be the routing, how is it going to get in, what are the hours? He asked if the Funworld driveway could be used for a temporary construction entrance, and whether that makes sense. He is concerned about construction traffic running through the Spit Brook intersection. He wants them to explain how it will work.

Mr. Weber added that there was a large project in Cambridge MA, and the city asked about how this was going to impact their neighborhood. He asked how they are going to mitigate impacts to surrounding businesses. He thinks they should use more than one road to enter and exit the site, which could hamper the site going forward.

Mr. Bollinger asked if this was a traditional infrastructure project, they may require a traffic control plan. That may be something the city staff wants to look at more closely. They wouldn't want to compound traffic issues in this area.

Mr. Bollinger said it looks as though despite the mixed use nature of the site, Costco is the largest traffic generator. The trip generation looks like the standardized numbers. Have they conducted any site specific data collection at the current site? Is the existing site underperforming according to the standard ITE rates, or over-performing? If the existing site is outperforming the ITE rates, would that alter the traffic analysis conducted? He suggested the parking be looked at to make sure it is adequate. It looks as though the study area is as far west as Royal Crest. Was there any consideration as to impact at the Exit 1 ramps? A substantial portion of the traffic is coming from Spit Brook Rd.

Mr. LeClair asked if consideration was made if the Fun World entrance was built now and connected to the ring road, what impact

would that have on traffic performance at Adventure Way and Spit Brook Rd?

Mr. Pratt said they did talk about it and decided not to include it because they weren't going to do that connection. If in the future it was needed for the commuter rail, it could be upgraded. A new study would have to be done. They didn't consider that at all.

Mr. LeClair said he needs to understand whether that entrance functionally has to be in place if there is development to the north. Does the traffic study address how far they can go before a third entrance is a must?

Mr. Pratt said they included Building 6 and 7 in their analysis. The only thing they didn't include was the train station, because they didn't know if there was going to be access off of Lovering Volvo. That would be ideal.

Mr. LeClair said he would like to know the effect of the Fun World entrance. He would want them to consider that in the construction traffic potential.

Mr. Pratt said they will look into it.

Mr. LeClair asked staff for the next steps on this.

Mr. Sullivan recommended continuing the public hearing to a date certain, May $6^{\rm th}$ at 7PM via Zoom. It would be wise to confirm the site walk for May $4^{\rm th}$ at 5:30 PM.

Mr. Varley asked if they should close the public hearing first.

PUBLIC MEETING

Mr. LeClair closed the public hearing and moved into the public meeting.

MOTION by Mr. Bollinger to table New Business - Subdivision Plan A21-0028 to the May 6, 2021 meeting

SECONDED by Mr. Weber

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

MOTION by Mr. Bollinger to table New Business - Subdivision Plan A21-0029 to the May 6, 2021 meeting

SECONDED by Mr. Weber

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

MOTION by Mr. Bollinger to table New Business - Subdivision Plan A21-0062 to the May 6, 2021 meeting

SECONDED by Mr. Weber

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

The Board said they will perform a site walk on Tuesday, May 4, at $5:30\,\mathrm{PM}$.

Mr. Bollinger asked if members of the public will be welcome to attend.

Mr. Sullivan said yes, any members of the public are welcome to attend. If they can't make quorum they will have to reschedule.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Referral from the Board of Aldermen on O-21-058, amending the Floodplain Management Land Use Ordinance.

Deb Chisholm, Waterways Manager

Ms. Chisholm said there is a summary of the proposed modifications in their packet. This is based on the City's participation in the national flood insurance program. One of the hoops they have to go through changed this year. By participating, residents who are required to have flood insurance get a discount.

Ms. Chisholm said they now need to require to change their ordinance so that instead of being able to build right on the same level as the base flood elevation, they have to be a minimum of 1-ft above that. All of the mechanical and electrical would need to

be 1-ft above as well. It's about enhancing their flood resiliency. There are approximately 300 properties in the special flood hazard area in the city.

Mr. Weber said the NRPC also assists in flood maps. Coming from a construction background there is a way to make foundations waterproof. Do they have any information on that?

Ms. Chisholm said the Office of Strategic Initiatives in Concord has a lot of resources available to homeowners.

Mr. Bollinger asked if there is any specific geographic area of the city this is applicable to.

Ms. Chisholm said mostly along the Nashua River, Salmon Brook, Hassell Brook, and Hales Brook. Just because a house isn't in the special hazard area doesn't mean it won't flood, or that they don't need flood insurance.

Ms. Harper asked if this would have any impact on projects currently in the queue.

Mr. Sullivan said not to his knowledge.

Ms. Chisholm said anyone who is already in the queue could move forward as they had in the past. Projects that come in after would be responsible for following the new ordinance.

Mr. Sullivan said it's more likely to impact small residences than large projects the Board might see. He expects the Building Dept. to see more of this impact.

 ${\bf MOTION}$ by Mr. Weber to give a favorable recommendation of O-21-058 to the Board of Alderman

SECONDED by Mr. Varley

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Third Party Consultant: Mr. Bollinger led a discussion on consultant and staff coordination on the traffic and stormwater.

Amazon: Ms. Harper led a brief discussion on the project in Hudson, in regards to regional impact.

MOTION to adjourn by Mr. Weber at 10:00 PM

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

APPROVED:

Mr. Varley, Acting Chair, Nashua Planning Board

DIGITAL RECORDING OF THIS MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING DURING REGULAR OFFICE HOURS OR CAN BE ACCESSED ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE. DIGITAL COPY OF AUDIO OF THE MEETING MAY BE MADE AVAILABLE UPON 48 HOURS ADVANCED NOTICE AND PAYMENT OF THE FEE.

Prepared by: Kate Poirier

Taped Meeting